



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/795,893	03/08/2004	Ken Kalinoski	263497US8	1528
22850	7590	11/05/2008	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				LOFTIS, JOHNNA RONEE
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3624				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/05/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/795,893	KALINOSKI, KEN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	JOHNNA R. LOFTIS	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 July 2008.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4,6-18 and 20-31 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-18 and 20-31 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a final office action upon examination of application number 10/795893. Claims 5 and 19 have been cancelled. Claims 1-4, 6-18, 20-31 are pending and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Amendments to claims 1 and 13 and the addition of claims 21-31 are acknowledged by the Examiner.

3. Examiner notes that Applicant's remarks indicate claim 20 was amended. No amendments exist for claim 20. Claim 20 being treated as originally filed.

4. Applicant's remarks also indicate claims 5 and 19 are amended, but also indicate claims 5 and 19 are cancelled. Claims 5 and 19 are being treated as cancelled.

5. Lastly, Applicant references claim 9 with respect to newly amended claim 13. Examiner notes the typographical error. Applicant meant to reference claim 19.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 7/3/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues, with regard to claims 1 and 13, that Capek et al does not apply constraints to heterogeneous resources. Further Applicant argues Capek et al does not teach identifying resources of the priority list that are unavailable to satisfy meeting constraint and also argues Capek et al does not teach monitoring the unavailable resources for availability. Examiner contends the claims, given the broadest reasonable interpretation, read on scheduling

Art Unit: 3624

of attendees. This is further supported by Applicant's own specification, page 1, wherein resources are defined as, among other things, "information technology professionals", in other words, attendees of the scheduled meetings. Examiner upholds previous rejections, asserting that Capek et al does teach the scheduling of heterogeneous resources.

7. Regarding the identification of resources of a priority list and monitoring of the resources, Examiner asserts that some attendees are mandatory therefore those attendees are given priority for scheduling purposes. As for monitoring, the optimization problem considers the availability of attendees and monitors the availability for attendance through iterations of the objective function to arrive at an optimal schedule wherein constraints are met.

8. Regarding claim 21, Applicant points to Examiner's rejection of claim 6. Examiner would like to point out that the cited portion of Capek et al (column 4, lines 19-32) and for further explanation, column 3, line 57 thru column 4, line 36, describes a collection of variables to schedule a meeting. The scheduling of the variables includes accessing data regarding the variables (see column 6, lines 34-38 – schedule database and resource database), constraints to the variables and availability of the variables.

9. In the previous Office Action mailed 4/8/08, notice was taken by the Examiner that certain subject matter is old and well known in the art. Per MPEP 2144.03(c), these statements are taken as admitted prior art because no traversal of this statement was made in the subsequent response. Specifically, the following has been taken as prior art: authorizing excess spending in certain situations; utilizing a telephone sending a computer generated voice reminder; and utilizing a cell phone call as a reminder

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

11. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-16, 20-25, and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a and e) as being anticipated by Capek et al, US 7,343,312.

As per claim 1, Capek et al teaches a user interface operable to accept meeting constraints (column 3, lines 6-56; column 7, lines 40+); a resource properties database storing schedules for the heterogeneous resources (column 4, lines 19-32); a scheduled events database storing schedules for the heterogeneous resources (column 4, lines 19-32); a configuration engine interfaced with the user interface and resource properties database, the configuration engine operable to apply the meeting constraints and the resource properties to priority rules that generate an ordered list of heterogeneous resource sets, each set having a valid configuration that

satisfies the meeting constraints (column 4, lines 1-36 – optimization of meeting variables based on weights); an availability engine interfaced with the configuration engine and the scheduled events database, the availability engine operable to select heterogeneous resources from the ordered list based on the scheduled availability of resources (column 4, lines 29-32); and identifying resources of the priority list that are unavailable to satisfy meeting constraints due to a scheduled use; and monitoring the unavailable resources for subsequent availability to satisfy the meeting constraints (column 7, lines 40-49 – availability is monitored for optimization of the schedule).

As per claim 2, Capek et al teaches the configuration engine is further operable to order the list of heterogeneous resources according to a cost function, the list ordered with the greatest priority given to the set of heterogeneous resources having the least cost to satisfy meeting constraints (column 3, lines 56-67; column 10, lines 48-50 – traditional optimization of variables based on constraints; includes minimization of costs).

As per claim 3, Capek et al teaches the configuration engine cost function adjusts to user-selected weights for one or more meeting constraints (column 7, lines 40-49 – constraints; column 10, lines 48-50 min. cost).

As per claim 4, Capek et al teaches the user-selected weights comprise one or more of meeting timing capacity and locality (column 7, lines 40-49 – constraints)

As per claim 6, Capek et al teaches an access controller interfaced with the availability engine and the resource properties database, the access controller operable to restrict scheduling of one or more resources having limited access properties (column 4, lines 19-32 – resource availability).

As per claim 8, Capek et al teaches the access controller is further operable to override a scheduled use of a resource to satisfy meeting constraints having a predetermined priority (column 10, lines 11-26).

As per claim 9, Capek et al teaches a reschedule engine operable to automatically reschedule overridden scheduled uses (column 10, lines 11-26).

As per claim 10, Capek et al teaches a notification engine interfaced with the availability and reschedule engines, the notification engine operable to automatically notify attendees of a meeting scheduled according to a set of resources of the ordered list and to automatically notify attendees of rescheduling (column 4, lines 50-57 – notifications and column 10, lines 11-26 – changes to schedules)

As per claim 11, Capek et al teaches a resource engine interfaced with the scheduled events database and the heterogeneous resources, the resource engine operable to initiate, terminate and track use of the heterogeneous resources in compliance with the schedule (column 4, lines 23-32 – schedules and monitors use of resources/equipment).

As per claim 12, Capek et al teaches the heterogeneous resources comprise at least video conference resources, audio conference resources and network resources (column 4, lines 19-31).

As per claim 13, Capek et al teaches identifying schedule constraints associated with the meeting (column 3, lines 6-56; column 7, lines 40+); ordering in priority a list of plural sets of candidate heterogeneous resources, each set having a valid configuration that satisfies the scheduling constraints (column 4, lines 1-36 – optimization of meeting variables based on weights); selecting a set of heterogeneous resources from the ordered list; scheduling the heterogeneous resources to support the meeting (column 4, lines 1-36 – optimization of meeting

variables based on weights); automatically notifying attendees (column 4, lines 50-57 – notifications); automatically initiating one or more the heterogeneous resources according to the schedule (column 4, lines 1-36 – optimization of meeting variables based on weights – resources are scheduled for use); and limiting access to predetermined heterogeneous resources according to one or more required authorizations (column 9, lines 60-67 – attendees have weighting factors indicating who is more important to the scheduling process

As per claim 14, Capek et al teaches identifying one or more biasing weights associated with one or more schedule constraints; and ordering the priority list according to the biasing weights (column 7, lines 40-49 – optimization with consideration of constraints)

As per claim 15, Capek et al teaches estimating a cost associated with each set of heterogeneous resources; and providing greater priority to sets having smaller costs (column 7, lines 40-49 – constraints; column 10, lines 48-50 min. cost).

As per claim 16, Capek et al teaches associating one or notification parameters with each attendee; and selecting one or more notification medium for each attendee based on the notification parameters associated with the attendee (column 4, lines 47-57 – attendees authorize automatic entry into a calendar).

As per claim 20, Capek et al teaches the heterogeneous resources comprise at least video conference, audio conference and network resources (column 4, lines 19-31).

As per claim 21, Capek et al teaches a user interface operable to accept meeting constraints (column 3, lines 6-56; column 7, lines 40+); a resource properties database storing schedules for the heterogeneous resources (column 4, lines 19-32); a scheduled events database storing schedules for the heterogeneous resources (column 4, lines 19-32); a configuration

engine interfaced with the user interface and resource properties database, the configuration engine operable to apply the meeting constraints and the resource properties to priority rules that generate an ordered list of heterogeneous resource sets, each set having a valid configuration that satisfies the meeting constraints (column 4, lines 1-36 – optimization of meeting variables based on weights); an availability engine interfaced with the configuration engine and the scheduled events database, the availability engine operable to select heterogeneous resources from the ordered list based on the scheduled availability of resources (column 4, lines 29-32); and an access controller interfaced with the availability engine and the resource properties database, the access controller operable to restrict scheduling of one or more resources having limited access properties (column 4, lines 19-32 – resource availability).

As per claim 22, Capek et al teaches the configuration engine is further operable to order the list of heterogeneous resources according to a cost function, the list ordered with the greatest priority given to the set of heterogeneous resources having the least cost to satisfy meeting constraints (column 3, lines 56-67; column 10, lines 48-50 – traditional optimization of variables based on constraints; includes minimization of costs).

As per claim 23, Capek et al teaches the configuration engine cost function adjusts to user-selected weights for one or more meeting constraints (column 7, lines 40-49 – constraints; column 10, lines 48-50 min. cost).

As per claim 24, Capek et al teaches the user-selected weights comprise one or more of meeting timing capacity and locality (column 7, lines 40-49 – constraints)

As per claim 25, Capek et al teaches identifying resources of the priority list that are unavailable to satisfy meeting constraints due to a scheduled use; and monitoring the unavailable

resources for subsequent availability to satisfy the meeting constraints (column 7, lines 40-49 – availability is monitored for optimization of the schedule).

As per claim 27, Capek et al teaches the access controller is further operable to override a scheduled use of a resource to satisfy meeting constraints having a predetermined priority (column 10, lines 11-26).

As per claim 28, Capek et al teaches a reschedule engine operable to automatically reschedule overridden scheduled uses (column 10, lines 11-26).

As per claim 29, Capek et al teaches a notification engine interfaced with the availability and reschedule engines, the notification engine operable to automatically notify attendees of a meeting scheduled according to a set of resources of the ordered list and to automatically notify attendees of rescheduling (column 4, lines 50-57 – notifications and column 10, lines 11-26 – changes to schedules)

As per claim 30, Capek et al teaches a resource engine interfaced with the scheduled events database and the heterogeneous resources, the resource engine operable to initiate, terminate and track use of the heterogeneous resources in compliance with the schedule (column 4, lines 23-32 – schedules and monitors use of resources/equipment).

As per claim 31, Capek et al teaches the heterogeneous resources comprise at least video conference resources, audio conference resources and network resources (column 4, lines 19-31).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claim 7, 17 and 18 and 26are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capek et al, US 7,343,312.

As per claims 7 and 26, Capek et al teaches the limited access property comprises an authorization code to exceed a predetermined cost associated with resource use (column 10, lines 48-50). Official notice is taken that it is old and well known to authorize excess spending in certain situations. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this authorization in Capek et al. As the optimization takes place it is inevitable that if other variables are optimized, the minimization of costs may suffer and due to budget concerns of any company, it would be obvious to authorize excess spending.

As per claim 17, Capek et al teaches the notification medium includes email, instant message or other means and since the system accommodates for telephonic communication (column 9, lines 20-26), but does not explicitly teach using a telephone to send a computer generated voice reminder. Offical notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a telephone sending a computer generated voice reminder. The modification of Capek et al with functionally equivalent equipment would produce a predictable result.

As per claim 18, Capek et al teaches the notification medium includes email, instant message or other means and since the system accommodates for telephonic communication (column 9, lines 20-26), but does not explicitly teach the notification further comprises cell phone call with in a predetermined time of the scheduled meeting. Offical notice is taken that it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a cell phone call as a reminder. The modification of Capek et al with functionally equivalent equipment would produce a predictable result

***Conclusion***

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHNNA R. LOFTIS whose telephone number is (571)272-6736. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brad Bayat can be reached on 571-272-6636. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/jl/  
10/30/08

/Bradley B Bayat/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3624